## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

TERESA ANNE SCOTT, : CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:02-CV-1586

•

Plaintiff : (Judge Conner)

:

v.

PAMELA WELLINGTON LACKEY and EVAN LESLIE ADAMS,

:

Defendants

## **ORDER**

AND NOW, this 11th day of January, 2006, upon consideration of defendant Evan Adams's motion for reconsideration (Doc. 226) of the order of court dated August 11, 2005 (Doc. 224), averring that the order did not address certain arguments set forth in Adams's motion to dismiss (Doc. 209), see <a href="Harsco Corp. v. Zlotnicki">Harsco Corp. v. Zlotnicki</a>, 779 F.2d 906, 909 (3d Cir. 1985) ("The purpose of a motion for reconsideration is to correct . . . errors of law or fact or to present newly discovered evidence."), and it appearing that the order did not address arguments regarding plaintiff's claims of invasion of privacy and conspiracy, see <a href="id.; see also">id.; see also</a> FED. R. CIV. P. 12(b)(6), that the limitations period for claims of invasion of privacy is one year, <a href="see">see</a> 42 PA. CON. STAT.

Ann. § 5523(1) (West 2005) ("The following actions and proceedings must be commenced within one year . . . [a]n action for libel, slander or invasion of privacy."), and that the limitations period for conspiracy mirrors the limitations period for the underlying act, <a href="see">see</a> Ammlung v. City of Chester, 494 F.2d 811, 814-15 (3d Cir. 1974) (stating that "Julnder Pennsylvania law, the statute of limitations with respect to a

conspiracy begins to run from each overt act causing damage"), and it further appearing that the court previously dismissed several of plaintiff's claims of defamation based upon the same one-year statute of limitations applicable to claims for invasion of privacy (see Doc. 123; see also Doc. 148), see 42 PA. CON. STAT. ANN. § 5523(1) (West 2005), it is hereby ORDERED that:

- 1. The motion for reconsideration (Doc. 226) is GRANTED.
- 2. The claims of invasion of privacy and conspiracy are DISMISSED to the extent that they are based upon the same publications as to which plaintiff's defamation claims were dismissed by the order of court dated March 25, 2004 (see Doc. 123).

/s/ Christopher C. Conner CHRISTOPHER C. CONNER United States District Judge